arXiv:1409.1606v1 [cs.NI] 4 Sep 2014

Power Optimal Non-contiguous Spectrum Access in Multi Front End Radio Enabled Point-to-Point Link

Muhammad Nazmul Islam, Narayan B. Mandayam, Ivan Seskar
Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering
WINLAB, Rutgers University, USA
Email: {mnislam,narayan,seskar}@winlab.rutgers.edu

Sastry Kompella
Information Technology Division,
Naval Research Laboratory, USA
Email: sk@ieee.org

***Abstract*—Non-contiguous spectrum chunks allow wireless links to flexibly access a wide amount of bandwidth. Multi-Channel Multi-Radio (MC-MR) and Non-Contiguous Orthogonal Frequency Division Multiplexing (NC-OFDM) are the two commercially viable strategies to access non-contiguous spectrum chunks. MC-MR accesses multiple non-contiguous chunks by activating multiple front ends which, in turn, increases the circuit power consumption of each of the activated front ends. NC-OFDM accesses non-contiguous spectrum chunks with a single front end by nulling remaining subchannels but increases spectrum span which, in turn, increases the power consumption of ADC and DAC. This work focuses on a point-to-point link where transmitter and receiver have multiple front ends and can employ NC-OFDM technology. We investigate optimal spectrum fragmentation in each front end from a system power – summation of transmit power and circuit power – perspective. We formulate a mixed integer non-linear program (MINLP) to perform power control and scheduling, and minimize system power by providing a greedy algorithm $(O(M^3I))$ where M and I denote the number of channels and radio front ends respectively.**

***Index Terms*—Cognitive radio, NC-OFDM, circuit power.**

I. Introduction

Uncoordinated interference in unlicensed networks result in an arbitrary number of non-contiguous spectrum chunks available for transmission, with some of these chunks separated by wide bands of interference limited spectrum. In TV white space [1], available channels themselves are non-contiguous in nature. Accessing only the "best" channel [2] or the "best" contiguous portion of these channels [3] leads to an underuse of the available spectrum. Hence, non-contiguous spectrum access is becoming increasingly popular among software defined radio researchers [4], [5].

Multi-Channel Multi-Radio (MC-MR) [6] and Non-Contiguous Orthogonal Frequency Division Multiplexing (NC-OFDM) are the two commercially viable choices to access non-contiguous spectrum chunks. MC-MR access multiple non-contiguous spectrum chunks by activating multiple radio front ends where each front end captures a contiguous portion of available spectrum and, hence, activates the circuit power consumption of each front end. NC-OFDM accesses non-contiguous spectrum chunks with a single front end radio by nulling intermediate spectrum and, hence, increases spectrum span [7] which, in turn, increases the power consumption of ADC and DAC.



Fig. 1: Multi-Channel Multi-Radio based Non-Contiguous Orthogonal Frequency Division Multiplexing operation

Fig. 1 shows the advantages and pitfalls of MC-MR and NC-OFDM. Here, channel 1, 3, 7 and 9 are available. One radio front end (shown at the top) accesses channel 1 & 3 and nulls channel 2 using NC-OFDM. Other radio front end (shown at the bottom) accesses channel 7 & 9 and nulls channel 8 using NC-OFDM. Due to the use of two front ends, the circuit power consumption of different components inside modulation block - e.g. filters, mixers, etc. – increases by a factor of 2. Due to the nulling of intermediate spectrum, each front end spans three channels (instead of two) and the circuit power consumption of ADC and DAC increase by a factor of 1.5.

This work performs optimal power control and scheduling to minimize the system power – summation of transmit and circuit power – of a point-to-point link where both nodes are equipped with MC-MR and NC-OFDM technology. Given an available list of non-contiguous spectrum chunks, we find the optimal spectrum fragmentation in each radio front end using a greedy algorithm $(O(M^3I))$ where M and I denote the number of channels and radio front ends respectively.

The authors of [8]–[10] investigated system power consumption in radio front ends but focused on contiguous spectrum access. Our other work [7] investigated system power minimization in non-contiguous spectrum access but focuses on single front end radio enabled nodes. This work minimizes system power of multi-front-end radio enabled nodes during non-contiguous spectrum access.

II. System Model

We focus on a point-to-point link where both transmitter and receiver are equipped with a set of front ends $\mathcal{I}$. Nodes access a set of available channels $\mathcal{M}$ to meet demand r. Let, $M = |\mathcal{M}|$ and $I = |\mathcal{I}|$. Let g^m denote the link gain at channel $m \in \mathcal{M}$. Let p_i^m and x_i^m represent the power control and scheduling decision variables in channel $m \in \mathcal{M}$ at front end $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

We assume that baseband signal processing techniques like multiuser detection and iterative decoding are not employed. Baseband power consumption is negligible in this scenario [8]. We focus on system power minimization during active mode (when the link is transmitting data) [8]. The authors of [8] show the following system power consumption model of transmitter (p_t) and receiver (p_r):

$$p_t = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 f_s + k_{pa} p\,,\ p_r = \beta_1 + \beta_2 f_s \tag{1}$$

Here, p is the emitted power at radio frequency, $k_{pa} = \frac{PAPR}{\eta}$, $k_{pa}p$ is the power consumption of programmable amplifier, $PAPR$ is the peak-to-average-power-ratio of the modulation scheme, η is the efficiency of the programmable amplifier and f_s is sampling rate. α_2 and β_2 are the slopes of DAC and ADC's power consumption versus sampling rate curves. α_1 (β_1) is the power consumption of all blocks of transmitter (receiver) - e.g. filter, mixer, etc. - excluding DAC (ADC) and programmable amplifier [8].

The total power consumption of a transmitter and receiver equipped with $\mathcal{I}$ front ends and $\mathcal{M}$ available channels can be written as:

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\big(k_{pa}\sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}} p_i^m + \alpha_{1,i} + \alpha_2 f_{s,i} + \beta_{1,i} + \beta_2 f_{s,i}\big) \tag{2}$$

where $\alpha_{1,i}$ ($\beta_{1,i}$) is the power consumption of all blocks of transmitter's (receiver's) i-th front end excluding DAC (ADC) and programmable amplifier. The sampling rate $f_{s,i}$ of i-th front end depends on its spectrum span, which in turn is determined by the choice of channels (subcarriers) selected for its intended transmission. *Spectrum span is defined as the gap between the furthest edges of the used channels*. Let q_i denote the spectrum span of the transmitter's and receiver's i-th front end. Using the analysis of [7],

$$q_i = \quad W \cdot \max\big(\big(\max_{m\in\mathcal{M}}\big(m\cdot x_i^m\big) - \min_{m\in\mathcal{M}}\big(m\cdot x_i^m + |M|\cdot(1-x_i^m)\big) + 1\big), 0\big)$$

Sampling rate should be at least twice the amount of spectrum span. We assume, $f_{s,i} = 2q_i$. Our overall optimization problem is shown below:

Problem I

$$\min \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\big(k_{pa}\sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}} p_i^m + \alpha_{1,i} + 2\alpha_2 q_i + \beta_{1,i} + 2\beta_2 q_i\big) \tag{3a}$$

s.t.

$$q_i \geq \quad W \cdot \max\big(\big(\max_{m\in\mathcal{M}}\big(m\cdot x_i^m\big) - \min_{m\in\mathcal{M}}\big(m\cdot x_i^m + |M|\cdot(1-x_i^m)\big) + 1\big), 0\big) \tag{3b}$$

$$\alpha_{1,i} \geq \alpha_{1,i} x_i^m\,,\ \beta_{1,i} \geq \beta_{1,i} x_i^m\ \forall m \in \mathcal{M}\,\forall i \in \mathcal{I} \tag{3c}$$

$$\sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} W\log_2\big(1 + \frac{p_i^m g^m}{N_0 W}\big) \geq r \tag{3d}$$

$$p_i^m \leq A x_i^m\,\forall m \in \mathcal{M}\,,\ \forall i \in \mathcal{I} \tag{3e}$$

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} x_i^m \leq 1\,\forall m \in \mathcal{M} \tag{3f}$$

$$x_{ij}^m \in \{0,1\}\,,\ p_i^m \geq 0\,, q_i \geq 0\,,\ \alpha_{1,i} \geq 0\,,\ \beta_{1,i} \geq 0\,\forall i \in \mathcal{I},\ \forall m \in \mathcal{M}\,, \tag{3g}$$

Here, Eq. (3c) denote that blocks like filter, mixer, etc. of i-th front end consume power only if the node activates i-th front end. Eq. (3d) denotes that summation of capacities across different channels and front ends must exceed demand r where N_0 is noise spectral density. Eq. (3e) couples power control and scheduling variables using a pre-defined big number A. Eq. (3f) represents that each channel can only be used by one of the front ends.

III. Solution Methodology

A. Theoretical Insights

The objective of problem I is linear. The constraints are convex. MI scheduling decision variables are binary. Problem I is a mixed integer convex program and can be solved optimally by solving 2^{MI} convex optimization programs. This section designs a low complexity algorithm by analyzing the characteristics of problem I.

Problem I is in essence the combination of two separate optimization problems. The objective is to minimize the summation of transmit and circuit power. Eq. 3d shows the constraints associated with transmit power. Eq. (3b) and (3f) denote the constraints circuit power. Eq. 3e couples power and scheduling variables. Hence, depending on the values of α_1, α_2, β_1 and β_2, problem I can have three sub-cases.

1) Case I: Contiguous Spectrum Access: When α_1, α_2, β_1 and β_2 are very large, circuit power completely dominates system power. Ignoring the contribution of transmit power $k_p a \sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}} p_m$ from Eq. (3a), problem I gets reduced to the following:

$$\min \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\big(\alpha_{1,i} + 2\alpha_2 q_i + \beta_{1,i} + 2\beta_2 q_i\big) \tag{4}$$

s.t. Eq. (3b),(3d), (3c), (3f), (3e) and (3g)

The objective of the optimization problem is an affine function of q_i, α_i and β_i for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. Minimum circuit power occurs if we use only one radio front end and one

channel. Since link gain of a channel does not vary across radio front ends, we can arbitrarily select a front end. Since original system power minimization problem contains both transmit and circuit power, it is prudent to select the channel with the best link gain.

B. Use of MC-MR over NC-OFDM

If $\alpha_2 >> \alpha_1$ and $\beta_2 >> \beta_1$, power consumption of ADC & DAC dominate that of filters, mixers, etc.. Here, problem I gets reduced to the following:

$$\min \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \big(k_{pa} \sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}} p_i^m + 2\alpha_2 q_i + 2\beta_2 q_i\big) \tag{5}$$

s.t. Eq. (3b),(3d), (3f), (3e) and (3g)

If number of radio front ends matches the number of non-contiguous spectrum chunks, the optimal solution of above problem activates multiple front ends but accesses contiguous spectrum chunks in each front end.

C. Use of NC-OFDM over MC-MR

If $\alpha_2 << \alpha_1$ and $\beta_2 << \beta_1$, power consumption of filters, mixers, etc.. dominate that of ADC & DAC. In this context, problem I gets reduced to the following:

$$\min \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \big(k_{pa} \sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}} p_i^m + \alpha_{1,i} + \beta_{1,i}\big) \tag{6}$$

(3d), (3c), (3f), (3e) and (3g)

The optimal solution to this problem selects only one radio front end and accesses non-contiguous spectrum chunks through NC-OFDM to meet rate requirement. In a practical setting, the values of α_1, α_2, β_1 and β_2 fall between the extreme cases mentioned above. In those cases, our algorithm selects a subset of channels and assign them to different front ends to minimize system power.

D. Low Complexity Algorithm

Using the insights of Sec, III-A, we develop a greedy algorithm here. Our algorithm can be explained simply as follows: *Pick the channel with the highest link gain at the first iteration. In each subsequent iteration, select exactly one channel and assign it to one front end, where both selection and assignment operations are the feasible operations that minimize total system power during the current iteration*. Table I is the pseudo-code of our algorithm. Here, $\mathcal{Y}_i \,\forall\, i \in \mathcal{I}$, is the set of channel indexes used by i-th front end.

At first, we select the channel with the best link gain (line 1). Without loss of generality, we assign this channel to first front end (line 2) and find associated total power (line 3). Thereafter, an infinite while loop starts (line 5) where each loop looks at all possible combinations of channel and front end assignment (line 6-7) and selects the channel-front end combination that minimizes system power during current iteration. For each channel-front end combination, we calculate spectrum span (line 9-10), flow allocation (line 12), power allocation (line 13) and total power (line 14). Line 15 compares total power values among all channel-front end combinations

Input:	$\mathcal{M}$, r, W, N_0, $g^m \,\forall m \in \mathcal{M}$
Output:	$x_i^m, p_i^m, \alpha_{1,i}, \beta_{1,i}, q_i\,, \mathcal{Y}_i \forall m \in \mathcal{M}, \forall i \in \mathcal{Y}$
Line	Operation
1	$ind = \arg\max_m(g^m)$, $val = \max_m(g^m)$.
2	$x_1^{ind} = 1$, $\mathcal{Y}_1 = \{ind\}$, $q_1 = W$, $\alpha_{1,1} = \alpha_1$, $\beta_{1,1} = \beta_1$
3	$P_{tot} = k_{pa}\big(2^{\frac{r}{W}} - 1\big)\frac{N_0}{val} + \alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 W + \beta_1 + 2\beta_2 W$
4	while (*true*)
5	$\forall m \in \mathcal{M}$
6	$\forall i \in \mathcal{I}$
7	$\widetilde{\alpha}_{1,i} = \alpha_1$, $\widetilde{\beta}_{1,i} = \beta_i$, $\tilde{q}_i = q_i$, $\tilde{x}_i^m = x_i^m$
8	if $m \notin \mathcal{Y}_i \forall\, i \in \mathcal{I}$
9	$MaxInd = max\{\mathcal{Y}_i, m\}$, $MinInd = min\{\mathcal{Y}_i, m\}$
10	$\tilde{q}_i = W(MaxInd - MinInd + 1)$, $\tilde{x}_i^m = 1$
11	$\widetilde{\alpha}_{1,i} = \alpha_1$, $\widetilde{\beta}_{1,i} = \beta_1$.
12	$\tilde{f}_j^n = \frac{r}{\sum_{j\in\mathcal{I}}\sum_{n\in\mathcal{M}}\tilde{x}_j^n}\tilde{x}_j^n \;\forall j \in \mathcal{I}, \forall n \in \mathcal{M}$
13	$\tilde{p}_j^n = (2^{\frac{\tilde{f}_j^n}{W}} - 1)\frac{N_0 W}{g^n} \;\forall j \in \mathcal{I}\,, \forall n \in \mathcal{M}$
14	$\widetilde{P}_i^m = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{I}}\big(\alpha_{1,j} + \alpha_2 q_j + \beta_{1,j} + \beta_2 q_j + k_{pa}\sum_{n\in\mathcal{M}}\tilde{x}_j^n\big)$
15	$[minP, minC, minI] = \min_m \min_i(\widetilde{P}_i^m)$
16	if $minP \le P_{tot}$,
17	$P_{tot} = minP$, $x_{minI}^{minC} = 1$, $\alpha_{1,minI} = \alpha_1$, $\beta_{1,minI} = \beta_1$.
18	$\mathcal{Y}_{minI} = \{\mathcal{Y}_{minI}, minC\}$.
19	$MaxInd = max\{\mathcal{Y}_{minI}\}$. $MinInd = min\{\mathcal{Y}_{minI}\}$.
20	$q_i = W(MaxInd - MinInd + 1)$.
21	else
22	*break*
23	$\min \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}} p_i^m$
24	s.t. $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}} Wlog(1 + \frac{p_i^m g^m}{N_0 W}) \ge r$,
25	$p_i^m \le A x_i^m$, $p_i^m \ge 0 \,\forall\, m \in \mathcal{M}$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{I}$.

TABLE I: Greedy Algorithm to Minimize System Power in a Multi-front end radio enabled point-to-point link

and finds the channel and front end combination that leads to minimum at the current iteration. If the current value of minimum total power is less than our previously stored value (line 16), we update total power, scheduling and spectrum span to accommodate current assignment (line 17-20). Otherwise, infinite loop breaks (line 21-22). The infinite while loop of line 4-22 provides scheduling variables, spectrum span and circuit power for all channels and front ends. Line 23-25 allocates optimal power across these scheduled channels and front ends. We assume equal flow per channel (line 12) during the inside iterations of while loop to reduce complexity but our final solution contains optimal flow and power allocation across channels and front ends (line 23-25).

1) Computational Complexity: Overall complexity comes from the while loop of line 5-22 and the convex minimization program of line 23-25. The loops of line 6 and 7 run M and I times respectively. For each channel-front end combination, we find power and flow values for all activated channels $(O(M))$. The outer while loop of line 5 runs at most M times since each iteration will either select a better channel or the loop will break. Hence, the while loop of line 5-22 runs at most $(O(M^3 I))$ times. The convex optimization program of line 23-25 contains MI number of constraints and can be solved in $(O(MI\log(MI)))$ time [12]. Hence, overall complexity is $(O(M^3 I))$.



Fig. 2: Power allocation among TV white space channels for portable devices of Cambridge [11] (Demand = 75 Mbps)

Channel Index	23	24	26	28	33	48	50
Center Freq. (MHz)	527	533	545	557	587	677	689

TABLE II: Available TV channels for portable devices in Cambridge, MA [11]

Parameters	α_1	α_2	β_1	β_2	k_{pa}	W
Values	45.4 mW	7.2 mW/MSPS	282.3 mW	5.5 mW/MSPS	10.67	6 MHz

TABLE III: Values of different parameters used in Sec. IV

E. Other Algorithms

We compare our algorithm with two other algorithms. First algorithm only focuses on MC-MR platforms and accesses contiguous spectrum chunks in each of its radio front end [6]. This algorithm puts enough power in contiguous spectrum chunks of each front end to meet rate requirement. We term this approach 'MC-MR'. Second algorithm only focuses on NC-OFDM technology, spreads power across all "good" channels and accesses multiple non-contiguous spectrum chunks with one front end [7]. We term this approach 'NC-OFDM'. Both these approaches try to minimize the transmitted power at radio frequency. We compare the performance of both these algorithms with our algorithm in next section.

IV. Simulation Results

We focus on a point-to-point link where both transmitter and receiver are portable devices and they access white space channels to meet rate requirement. Table II shows the indexes and center frequencies of available channels [11]. Here, $\mathcal{M} = \{23, 24, 26, 28, 33, 48, 50\}$, $M = 7$. We assume that both transmitter and receiver are equipped with two front ends, i.e., $\mathcal{I} = \{1, 2\}$ and $I = 2$. Table III shows the values of different parameters that we used in this section. A detailed explanation of these values can be found in [7].

The left subfigure of Fig. 2 shows the link gain across these channels. We assumed 500m distance between two nodes, path loss with exponent 3 and 15 dB random variation to generate link gain across these channels. We assume 75 Mbps demand (r) for this simulation scenario. The 2nd and 3rd subfigures (from left) of Fig. 2 show power allocation variables of our algorithm across both front ends. Our algorithm selects "better" channels - in terms of link gain - among the whole list, accesses "nearby" non-contiguous spectrum chunks in each front end and allocates transmit power to meet demand requirement.

'MC-MR' algorithm can only access contiguous spectrum chunks in each of its front end. Since channel 23 & 24 - the only contiguous chunk with two channels - have poor link gain, this algorithm selects channel 26 and 28 in each of its radio front end. Since demand is much higher than used bandwidth, The 4th and 5th subfigures (from left) of Fig. 2 shows that MC-MR algorithm allocates very high amount of power in each channel and meets rate requirement. The rightmost subfigure of Fig. 2 shows that 'NC-OFDM' algorithm spreads power across all 'good' channels, accesses multiple non-contiguous spectrum chunks *with one front end* and spans a wide amount of spectrum. As a result, 'NC-OFDM' algorithm consumes high power in ADC/DAC circuits [7].

Fig. 3 compares the total power consumption of our algorithm with that of 'MC-MR' and 'NC-OFDM' algorithm for different demand values. As evident from Fig. 2, 'MC-MR' algorithm consumes a high amount of transmit power for high demand. When demand is low (e.g. 5 Mbps), both our algorithm and 'MC-MR' approach access only one channel using one front end and consume equal system power. 'NC-



Fig. 3: Comparison of system power consumption among different approaches

OFDM' approach spans wider amount of spectrum and, hence, consumes excessive circuit power in ADC and DAC. Our algorithm reaps the inherent benefits of 'MC-MR' and 'NC-OFDM' approach and combines them to minimize system power across all scenarios.

V. Conclusion

MC-MR and NC-OFDM allow nodes to access non-contiguous spectrum chunks but increase circuit power either by activating multiple radio front ends or by spanning wider spectrum. This work performed joint optimal power control and scheduling to minimize the system power of a point-to-point link where both nodes are equipped with MC-MR and NC-OFDM technology. We designed a low complexity greedy algorithm $(O(M^3I))$ where M and I denote the number of channels and radio front ends respectively.

The number of available channels and non-contiguous spectrum chunks vary across different places of USA [11]. Our work can be extended to investigate how a radio with limited number of front ends performs in non-contiguous spectrum access across different US cities.

References

[1] C. Cordeiro, K. Challapali, D. Birru, and S. Shankar, "IEEE 802.22: the first worldwide wireless standard based on cognitive radios," in *Proc. IEEE DySPAN'2005*, Nov. 2005, p. 328337.

[2] C. Stevenson et. al., "Ieee 802.22: The first cognitive radio wireless regional area network standard," *IEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 47, pp. 130–138, 2009.

[3] P. Bahl, R. Chandra, T. Moscibroda, R. Murty, and M. Welsh, "White space networking with wi-fi like connectivity," *ACM SIGCOMM 2009*, vol. 39, pp. 27–38, 2009.

[4] L. Yang, B. Y. Zhao, and H. Zheng, "The spaces between us: Setting and maintaining boundaries in wireless spectrum access," in *Proc. ACM MOBICOM 2010*, Sept. 2010, pp. 37–48.

[5] L. Yang, W. Hou, L. Cao, B. Y. Zhao, and H. Zheng, "Supporting demanding wireless applications with frequency-agile radios," in *Proc. 7th USENIX conference on Networked Systems Design and Implementation*, Apr. 2010, pp. 1–5.

[6] M. Kodialam and T. Nandagopal, "Characterizing the capacity region in multi-radio multi-channel wireless mesh networks," in *Proc. ACM MOBICOM' 2005*, Aug. 2005, pp. 73–87.

[7] M. N. Islam, N. B. Mandayam, S. Kompella, and I. Seskar, "Power optimal non-contigous spectrum access," Submitted to IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications. Available at http://arxiv.org/pdf/1309.0861v2.pdf.

[8] S. Cui, A. Goldsmith, and A. Bahai, "Energy-constrained modulation optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 4, pp. 2349 – 2360, SEP 2005.

[9] P. Grover, K. A. Woyach, and A. Sahai, "Towards a communication-theoretic understanding of system-level power consumption," *IEEE Journals on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 29, pp. 1744 – 1755, SEP 2011.

[10] G. Li, Z. Xu, C. Xiong, C. Yang, S. Zhang, Y. Chen, and S. Xu, "Energy-efficient wireless communications: tutorial, survey, and open issues," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 18, pp. 28–35, 2011.

[11] "Show my white space," accessed May 2012, http://whitespaces.spectrumbridge.com/whitespaces.

[12] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,MA, 1999.